

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 ABU DHABI 001119

SIPDIS

STATE FOR NEA/ARP; NEA/PPD; NEA/RA; INR/R/MR; PA; INR/NESA;
INR/B; RRU-NEA IIP/G/NEA-SA
WHITE HOUSE FOR PRESS OFFICE; NSC
SECDEF FOR OASD/PA
USCINCCENT FOR POLAD
LONDON FOR MCKUNE

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [OIIP](#) [KMDR](#) [KPAO](#) [AE](#) [TC](#)

SUBJECT: MEDIA REACTION: TEHRAN AND WASHINGTON

11. SUMMARY: A SAUDI COLUMNIST IN "AL-ITTIHAD" WONDERERS WHY WASHINGTON HAD TO RESORT TO ITS ENEMY IRAN AND NOT TO ITS ARAB ALLIES TO RESOLVE IRAQ'S ISSUES. AN EDITORIAL IN "AL-ITTIHAD" CLAIMS PRESIDENT BUSH'S RECENT SPEECH SHOWS THAT ZIONIST INFLUENCE CONTROLS THE WHITE HOUSE. A UAE COLUMNIST IN "AL-ITTIHAD" OPINES THAT EVERYONE IN HAS LOST IN IRAQ. END SUMMARY.

12. Under the headline "Why did Washington resort to its first enemy Iran", Dr. Khalid Al-Dakheel, a Saudi columnist wrote in Abu Dhabi-based Arabic daily "Al-Ittihad," (circulation 65,000) 6/22:

"Bush in his speech affirmed that his country would use force against Iran to defend Israel. With the Bush administration's negative position against Iran possessing nuclear weapons, a question comes: Why does Washington need to negotiate with Tehran to find a way out of Iraq? Another question: Why is Washington resorting to Iran, its first enemy in the region, instead of resorting to its Arab allies? This step taken by Washington has multiple connotations: It confirms that Iranian influence has reached a point where it cannot be overlooked inside Iraq, while at the same time, Washington admits that Iran has interests in Iraq and that it is time now to have these interests enmeshed with Iraq's current issues. Does Washington want to open a door for negotiations with Tehran where it would recognize the legitimacy of Iran's interests in Iraq against Iraq giving up its nuclear weapons? What does this also tell us about U.S. foreign policies towards the Arab countries? ...Can these negotiations lead to an exit from the current situation in Iraq and having Washington leave Iraq? It more likely seems that this step yields reverse results... It is also strange that the Arab weakness is the biggest factor that has allowed such a dichotomy which maybe the reason behind removing the Iraqi issues from the hands of Arab foreign policies to end up as a captive of two strategies: either the American strategy backed up by the Israelis, or the Iranian strategy. "

13. Under the headline "A message to those who do not yet understand", Abu Dhabi-based Arabic daily "Al-Ittihad," (circulation 65,000) 6/22 wrote:

"What the two American researchers have said complies with many studies taken, especially the American ones, affirming the fact that the Zionist entity is the force that influences the direction of the new conservative's administration at the white house. Bush's speech came as a literal translation to this fact when he said that he would use force to defend its ally Israel. This happens at a time when the region needs somebody to evict the Israeli terror from it and not encourage this terror while nurturing and protecting it. "

13. Under the headline "The third year for U.S. occupation: Everyone is loosing in Iraq", UAE columnist Mohamed Al-Hammadi wrote on Abu Dhabi-based Arabic daily "Al-Ittihad," (circulation 65,000) 6/22:

"Iraq has become a hostage not of the U.S. but of regional countries. It has reached a point where the U.S. and Iran want to bargain over it, and it seems that the price they are bargaining is too precious against the democracy that we have witnessed. By the U.S. accepting to sit down with Iran and confer with it on Iraq, shows that Iran is reaping the fruits of patience and this is not a reassuring indicator. Iraqis are watching the U.S. and Iran bargaining with each other on their own issues. Iran's interference is not new; what is new is that it is seeking for an international cover to legitimize its interference, while Iraq's sovereignty is ignored. During Saddam's era, all Iraqis agreed that they had Saddam Hussein as their one and only enemy, but today Iraqis enemies are quadrupling and yesterday's friends are today's enemies. Some Iraqis see Americans as their enemies, while others see Al-Zargawi and the terrorists with him as their enemies. The Shiites see Sunnis as their enemies, while some Sunnis consider the Shiites as their

rivals. The resistance regards members of the current Iraqi government as their opponents. On the other hand, the Iraqi politicians take their neighboring countries as their enemies... The list of enemies is getting so long. After 3 years of occupation, the United States along with its allies including Iran should realize that any security breach or civil war means a breach in the entire region."

SISON